

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Advisory Action dated May 25, 2004. In order to advance prosecution of the present Application, Claims 1, 11, and 16 have been amended. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this Application.

The Examiner issued a Final Action on March 4, 2004. Applicant submitted a Response to Examiner's Final Action on May 4, 2004. The Examiner issued an Advisory Action on May 25, 2004 stating that the Response to Examiner's Final Action would not be entered because it raised new issues requiring further searching and consideration. Applicant respectfully requests that the Response to Examiner's Final Action be entered and considered by the Examiner pursuant to this Request for Continued Examination. For the convenience of the Examiner, the amendments made to the claims in the Response to Examiner's Final Action and the accompanying comments are repeated herein with certain additional amendments made for clarity and consistency purposes.

Claims 1 and 6-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Somasundaram, et al. Independent Claims 1 and 11 recite in general the ability to capture information immediately prior to and immediately subsequent to a triggering event with information being continuously captured in a first set of blocks of a memory array prior to the triggering event and information being captured in a second set of blocks of the memory array subsequent to the triggering event while maintaining information captured in the first set of blocks of the memory array. By contrast, the Davis patent does not disclose the use of first and second sets of blocks in a memory for capturing information prior to and subsequent to a triggering

event as provided in the claimed invention. Moreover, the Somasundaram, et al. patent does not include an on-chip trace recorder capable of capturing any information associated with a triggering event. Support for the above recitation can be found at page 13, line 15, to page 14, line 19, of Applicant's specification. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1 and 6-15 are patentably distinct from the proposed Davis - Somasundaram, et al. combination.

Claims 2-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Somasundaram, et al. and further in view of Voith, et al. Independent Claim 1, from which Claims 2-5 depend, has been shown above to be patentably distinct from the proposed Davis - Somasundaram, et al. combination. Moreover, the Voith, et al. patent does not include any additional disclosure combinable with either the Davis or Somasundaram, et al. patents that would be material to patentability of these claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2-5 are patentably distinct from the proposed Davis - Somasundaram, et al. - Voith, et al. combination.

Claims 16-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Somasundaram, et al. and further in view of Microsoft Computer Dictionary. Independent Claim 16 includes a similar limitation as found in Claims 1 and 11 discussed above and shown to be patentably distinct from the proposed Davis - Somasundaram, et al. combination. Moreover, the Microsoft Computer Dictionary does not include any additional disclosure combinable with either the Davis or Somasundaram, et al. patents that would be material to patentability of these claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 16-20 are

patentably distinct from the proposed Davis - Somasundaram, et al. - Microsoft Computer Dictionary combination.

Attached herewith is a check in an amount of \$770.00 made payable to the "Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks" to satisfy the request for continued examination fee of 37 C.F.R. §1.17(e).

Applicant respectfully requests a one month extension of time for filing this Request for Continued Examination. Attached herewith is a Notification of Extension of Time with check in support thereof.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place the Application in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and full allowance of Claims 1-20.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any amount required or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Attorneys for Applicant



Charles S. Fish

Reg. No. 35,870

July 6, 2003

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600

Dallas, TX 75201-2980

• (214) 953-6507

Customer Number: 05073